

**A
THEOLOGY
OF
THE
NEW TESTAMENT**

by
GEORGE ELDON LADD

33 THE PAULINE PSYCHOLOGY

**William B. Eerdmans
Publishing Company**



Grand Rapids
Michigan

33

THE PAULINE PSYCHOLOGY

Literature:

E. D. Burton, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh* (1918), pp. 186-98; H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man* (1926), pp. 104-35; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the NT*, I (1951), 190-245; J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body* (1952); W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man* (1956); W. G. Kümmel, *Man in the NT* (1963); D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul* (1964), pp. 31-44; E. Schweizer, "Sarx," *TDNT* (1964, 1971), VII, 125-38; E. Schweizer, "Pneuma," *TDNT* VI, 375-451; H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the NT* (1969), pp. 173-83; R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms* (1971).

Paul employs a rich vocabulary in speaking about man, but he seldom speaks of man as such. His perspective is man as a Christian.

Paul's view of man has been interpreted in three ways. Scholars of an older generation understood I Thessalonians 5:23, where Paul prays for the preservation of the spirit, soul, and body, to be a psychological statement and understood Paul in terms of trichotomy; spirit, soul, and body are three separable parts of man.¹ Other scholars have interpreted Paul against the background of Greek dualism and have seen a dichotomy of soul and body.² Recent scholarship has recognized that such terms as body, soul, and spirit are not different, separable faculties of man but different ways of viewing the whole man.

BACKGROUND. In order to appreciate Pauline psychology, we need to have in mind the chief elements in the Greek and Hebrew concepts of man. One of the most influential thinkers for the subsequent history of Greek philosophy was Plato. Plato held to a dualism of two worlds, the noumenal and the phenomenal, and to an anthropological dualism of body-soul. The body was not *ipso facto* evil, but it was a burden and hindrance to the soul. The wise man cultivated the soul so that it might rise above the body and

¹ See F. Delitzsch, *A System of Biblical Psychology* (1867), pp. 103-19.

² G. H. C. MacGregor and A. C. Purdy, *Jew and Greek: Tutors Unto Christ* (1936), pp. 335f.

at death be freed from the body and escape to the world above.³ In Hellenistic times, the body, belonging to the world of matter, was thought to be *ipso facto* evil by the gnostics. Stacey has pointed out that most of the philosophers of Greece followed Plato in his view of soul and body, and that it was so impressed upon the civilized world that “no man can discuss the relation of soul and body today without encountering some resurgence of the Platonic view.”⁴

The Hebrew view of man is very different from the Greek view. There is no trace of dualism. The Hebrew word for body occurs only fourteen times in the Old Testament⁵ and never stands in contrast to the soul (*nephesh*). More often, the word for flesh (*basar*) is used to designate the body (23 times). This word carries primarily a physical meaning. One significant usage is “flesh” as a symbol of human frailty in relation to God. *Basar* appears as something that men and animals possess in their weakness, which God does not possess. “My spirit shall not abide in man for ever, for he is flesh” (Gen. 6:3). “The Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses are flesh, and not spirit” (Isa. 31:3). *Basar* refers to human beings in their frailty and transience, to man in his limitations, as distinct from the infinite God.⁶

Soul (*nephesh*) is not a higher part of man standing over against his body but designates the vitality or life principle in man. God breathed into man’s nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living *nephesh* (Gen. 2:7). Body and the divine breath together make the vital, active *nephesh*. The word is then extended from the life principle to include the feelings, passions, will, and even the mentality of man.⁷ It then comes to be used as a synonym for man himself. Families were numbered as so many souls (Gen. 12:5; 46:27). Incorporeal life for the *nephesh* is never visualized. Death afflicted the *nephesh* (Num. 23:10) as well as the body.

A third term is spirit (*ruach*). The root meaning of the word is “air in motion,” and it is used of every kind of wind. The word is often used of God. God’s *ruach* is his breath—his power—working in the world (Isa. 40:7), creating and sustaining life (Ps. 33:6; 104:29-30). Man’s *ruach*—his breath—comes from God’s *ruach* (Isa. 42:5; Job 27:3). Thus man is conceived of as possessing *ruach*, inbreathed from God, as an element in his personality (Gen. 45:27; I Sam. 30:12; I Kings 10:5). God is the supreme spirit (Gen. 6:3; Isa. 31:3). *Ruach* in man is expanded to include the whole range of emotional and volitional life, thus overlapping with *nephesh*.⁸ The difference between *nephesh* and *ruach* in man is that

³ See G. E. Ladd, *The Pattern of NT Truth* (1968), pp. 13-20; W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man* (1956), pp. 72-74.

⁴ W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, p. 74. Stacey gives an excellent brief history of the Greeks’ view of man.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

⁷ Illustrations in *ibid.*, p. 87.

⁸ Illustrations in *ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

nephesh designates man in relation to other men as man living the common life of men, while *ruach* is man in his relation to God.⁹ However, neither *nephesh* nor *ruach* is conceived of as a part of man capable of surviving the death of *basar*. They both designate man as a whole viewed from different perspectives.

In the intertestamental period, a distinct development is to be noted; both *pneuma* and *psychē* are conceived as entities capable of separate existence. I Enoch speaks of the souls of men who have died (9:3, 10) and also of their spirits (13:6; 20:3). In describing Sheol, it speaks of "the spirits of the souls of the dead" (22:3) and thereafter refers to their spirits (22:5, 7, 9, 11, 13). The Wisdom of Solomon uses soul and spirit interchangeably (1:4-5; 15:11; 16:14; cf. I En. 98:12) and refers to the pre-existence of the soul (8:19), and to its existence after death (16:14). Furthermore, the body is seen to be a burden to the soul (9:15). Several times the words body and soul are used together to refer to man as a whole (II Macc. 6:30; 7:37), and the Wisdom of Solomon 8:19f. speaks of the coming together of two dissimilar parts, body and soul, to form man. In Wisdom, *psychē* is used several times where it seems to be a separate entity of man (2:22; 3:1), and in one place the soul is imprisoned after death (16:14). After death, the soul that was "lent" to man must be returned, presumably to God (15:8). While Wisdom seems to reflect Hellenistic influences, "This idea of pre-existence . . . was not the highly developed belief which Philo took into his Judaism from the Greek philosophers."¹⁰ In Wisdom 15:16, man is said to borrow his spirit for the duration of his life, which implies that his *pneuma* existed in the presence of the Lord's spirit before he was born.¹¹

Another development in the intertestamental literature is that while in the Old Testament *ruach* is the power of God at work in the world, in the later writings the personal use of *pneuma* is primary. The origin of spirit in the divine breath is forgotten and the spirit is regarded as a constituent element in man. This does not necessarily imply Greek influence, only that the development of *ruach* was completed in the *pneuma* of the intertestamental writings.¹² God, the Lord of all, is the "Lord" of spirits (I En. 49:2, 4; 67:8). Spirit is often used of God; soul is never so used. This suggests that *pneuma* represents man in his Godward side,¹³ while *psychē* represents man in his human side. Another aspect of this development is that *pneuma* is frequently used of supernatural spirits who can affect man for good or bad.¹⁴

PSYCHĒ. The Pauline usage of *psychē* is closer to the Old Testament than is the intertestamental literature. Paul never uses *psychē* as a separate entity

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

¹² Illustrations in *ibid.*, p. 100.

¹³ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁴ Illustrations in *ibid.*, pp. 99-100.

in man, nor does he ever intimate that the *psychē* can survive the death of the body. *Psychē* is "life" understood against a Hebrew background.¹⁵ In Romans 11:3, Paul quotes from the Old Testament where Elijah complains that "they seek my *psychē*." *Psychē* here is clearly his life. When Epaphroditus risked his soul for Paul, he nearly died (Phil. 2:30). When Aquila and Priscilla risked their necks for Paul's *psychē*, they nearly lost their lives on behalf of his.

There are one or two examples where *psychē*, like the Old Testament usage, is used of an individual person. "Every soul of man that works evil" (Rom. 2:9) is correctly translated by the RSV, "every human being who does evil." When "every soul" is exhorted to be subject to the governing authorities, Paul obviously refers to "every person" (Rom. 13:1, RSV).

Frequently *psychē* goes beyond mere physical life and refers to man as a thinking, working, and feeling person. When Paul is willing gladly to spend and be spent for the souls of his converts (II Cor. 12:15), he refers to something far more than their bodily life. We do not need to recognize here a distinct contrast between the soul and the body; Paul is concerned for the welfare of the whole man and everything life involves; but the emphasis is upon the inner life. Paul's desire to share with the Thessalonians not only the gospel but also his very soul (I Thess. 2:8) suggests more than a willingness to die for them; it means a sharing of his whole being including all that is involved in a redeemed personality. To strive for the gospel with one's soul is very close to standing firm in one spirit (Phil. 1:27); here *psychē* is nearly interchangeable with *pneuma*. To do the will of God from the heart (Eph. 6:6; *ek psychēs*) means to serve God with all of one's being and personality. However, *psychē* and *pneuma* are not strictly interchangeable but refer to man's inner life viewed from two points of view. *Pneuma* is man's inner self viewed in terms of man's relationship to God and to other men; *psychē* is man as a living being, as a human personality, the vitality of man viewed from the point of view of his body and flesh. Paul never speaks of the salvation of the soul, nor is there any intimation of the pre-existence of the soul. "*Psychē* is that specifically human state of being alive which inheres in man as a striving, willing, purposing self."¹⁶ He never uses the obvious Hellenistic summary of man: body and soul.¹⁷

¹⁵ R. Bultmann, *Theology of the NT* (1951), I, 207.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 205.

¹⁷ It should be noted that other New Testament writings diverge from Paul in their use of *psychē* and regard it as an entity in man standing over against his body and capable of salvation. Jesus contrasted the death of the body and the destruction of the soul (Mt. 10:28). The preservation of the soul (Heb. 10:39) refers to something more than physical life (see also Jas. 1:21; I Pet. 1:9). John saw the souls of the martyrs under the altar (Rev. 6:9), and at the glorious advent of Christ, the souls of the martyrs will be raised in resurrection life to share the millennial reign (Rev. 20:4). In such references as these, *psychē* is man's essential self, which is capable of continued existence after the dissolution of

There is one difference between Paul and the Old Testament. The central term for man in the Old Testament, in the intertestamental literature, and in the rabbis was *nephesh* or *psychē*. In Paul it is *pneuma*. "Spirit" has made a dramatic advance, *psychē* a dramatic retreat. Stacey thinks that this was not due to Hellenistic influences but to Paul's Christian experience in which his knowledge of the *pneuma hagion* set the basis for his anthropology, and *pneuma* took the leading role.¹⁸

SPIRIT. The most important Pauline use of *pneuma* is as a designation for God's Spirit. He often speaks of the *pneuma* of God (Rom. 8:14; I Cor. 2:11; 3:16; II Cor. 3:3, etc.), of the Holy Spirit (I Thess. 4:8; Eph. 1:13; 4:30), and of the Spirit of Christ (Rom. 8:9; Gal. 4:6; Phil. 1:19). We have already seen that Paul in some real sense identifies Christ and the Spirit in the work of salvation. The second Adam became a life-giving Spirit (I Cor. 15:45).¹⁹

The sphere of the Spirit's activity is humanity, and it is with the spirit of man that God's Spirit is largely concerned.²⁰

It is with the spirit that man serves God (Rom. 1:9). Man as spirit is able to enjoy union with the Lord (I Cor. 6:17). Prayer (I Cor. 14:14) and prophecy (I Cor. 14:32) are exercises of man's spirit. Grace bestowed by God upon man is in the sphere of the spirit (Gal. 6:18). Renewal is experienced in the spirit (Eph. 4:23). The divine life imparted to man is in the realm of the spirit even while the body is perishing (Rom. 8:10). God through the Spirit witnesses to man's spirit that he is a child of God (Rom. 8:16). While Paul never asserts it explicitly, there is little doubt but that he could have said, in the words of Jesus, "God is spirit" (Jn. 4:24). It is because man also is spirit that he is able to enter into relationships with God, to fellowship with God, and to enjoy the blessings of God.

A further important significance of *pneuma* is found in contexts where it is set over against his body as the inner dimension of man in contrast with the outer. It is necessary to seek sanctification in both body and spirit (I Cor. 7:34; II Cor. 7:1).²¹ A clear contrast between the inner and outer aspects of man is found in Romans 8:10. When the Spirit indwells a man, although his body is dying ("dead" potentially) because of sin, his spirit is alive because of righteousness. In this age the Holy Spirit imparts life only to the spirit of man; in the Age to Come it will also infuse with life

the body. This is a usage that does not contradict, but which complements the Pauline use of the term.

¹⁸ W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, pp. 126-27.

¹⁹ See above, p. 422; W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, pp. 129-30 for a summary of this. See also E. Schweizer, "Pneuma," *TDNT* VI, 420-34. Schweizer regards Paul's thought about the divine *pneuma* to designate a celestial matter or substance; but this is not at all clear. Cf. W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, p. 177. Schweizer's discussion of the human spirit is very inadequate. *TDNT* VI, 434-37.

²⁰ W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, p. 132. Elsewhere he speaks of it as the "Godward side of man"—a usage not found in the Old Testament (p. 137).

²¹ In the latter reference *sarx* is used as the equivalent of body.

the mortal body (v. 11). Bultmann recognizes a seeming difficulty in this passage and solves it by interpreting *pneuma* to refer not simply to the self, the person, but to the divine *pneuma* that has become the subject self of the Christian.²² Such an interpretation appears to fit the data to a theory and not deduce the theory from the data. The contrast between the mortal body and the spirit is not that of man versus the Spirit of God, but that of the material part of man versus the immaterial or spiritual part. The one is dying, mortal; the other has been made alive.

The contrast between the inner and the outer is very clear where the spirit refers to a quality or element diametrically opposite to the flesh. Worship of God in spirit (Phil. 3:3) is the opposite of worship in purely material form. Circumcision "in the spirit" is the opposite of literal physical circumcision (Rom. 2:28f.)

In the discussion of glossolalia, man's spirit is even differentiated from his mind (I Cor. 14:14). "For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unfruitful." There is a realm of fellowship with God in which spirit enjoys fellowship with Spirit, a realm that transcends the processes of the mind because man is spirit. He may enjoy immediate fellowship with God in a "mystical" relationship that does not contradict but which transcends the cognitive faculty. Bultmann attempts to avoid the embarrassment of this verse by understanding "my spirit" to be the Spirit of God bestowed upon man. The contrast is therefore between the human mind and the divine Spirit.²³ This, however, is rather devious exegesis; for when one interprets this expression in the light of the same or similar expressions elsewhere,²⁴ the conclusion is unavoidable that the spirit is man's spirit, man's true inner self that enjoys direct fellowship through prayer with God.

Since *pneuma* is man's true inner self, the word is naturally used to represent man as such in terms of his self-consciousness as a willing and knowing self.²⁵ To act in the same spirit (II Cor. 12:18) means to act with the same attitude and intention. To stand firm in one spirit (Phil. 1:27) means to share the same outlook and judgment and refers to a common orientation of the will. When Paul speaks of finding refreshment or rest for his spirit (I Cor. 6:18; II Cor. 2:13; 7:13), he means that he has found inner rest. There is, however, a contrast²⁶ between rest of mind (II Cor. 2:13) and rest of the flesh (II Cor. 7:5). The former reference places the emphasis solely upon inner distress while the latter includes the outward afflictions that Paul encountered.²⁷

²² R. Bultmann, *Theology of the NT*, I, 208.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

²⁴ See Rom. 1:9; 8:16; I Cor. 5:4; 16:18; II Cor. 2:13; 7:13; Phil. 4:23.

²⁵ Bultmann brilliantly works out this use of *pneuma*, and at this point we may cordially agree with his conclusions (*Theology*, I, 206f.). We disagree with Bultmann in his insistence that this meaning exhausts the significance of the concept.

²⁶ Against Bultmann (*Theology*, I, 206).

²⁷ Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 203, 204.

The question has been raised whether all men possess *pneuma*, or whether it is a distinct possession of Christians by virtue of their having received God's *pneuma*.²⁸ A key verse is I Corinthians 2:11: "For what person knows a man's thoughts except the spirit of man which is in him." This seems to be a psychological statement that is universal in its application. *Pneuma* is used here of man's self-awareness or self-consciousness.²⁹ Although Paul does not affirm it, it follows logically that because all men are *pneumata*, they are capable of enjoying a distinctive relationship to each other. Furthermore, because God too is *pneuma*, the human *pneuma* is the "organ which receives the Spirit of God."³⁰ It is because man possesses *pneuma* that he is capable of being related to God. Kümmel may be right in insisting that this verse does not mean that man stands in a position particularly close to God,³¹ but it does suggest that because man is *pneuma*, he is capable of receiving the divine *pneuma* and thus coming into a close living relationship with God. We would agree with Stacey that all men possess *pneuma*, but the reception of the divine *pneuma* means the renewal of the human *pneuma* so that it acquires new dimensions.³² In Romans 8:10, to which Stacey refers, Paul says that though your bodies are dead (i.e., mortal, dying), your spirits are alive because of righteousness. We cannot follow those scholars who understand *pneuma* in this verse to refer to the divine *pneuma*.³³ The thought seems to be that while the body is still mortal and dying, the divine *pneuma* has imparted to man the gift of life, but this life is experienced on the level of the human *pneuma*.³⁴ When Paul says that men are in their human situation dead but made alive in Christ (Eph. 2:1), he must mean that they were spiritually dead, i.e., their spirits did not enjoy a living relationship with God. To be made alive means to be quickened in spirit so that men enter into living fellowship with God.

Although Paul never speaks of the survival of either soul or spirit after the death of the body, the question must be raised whether death means extinction, as Stacey suggests,³⁵ or whether Paul does believe in some sort of survival of the self after death. Here we must agree with Whiteley, who speaks of Paul's "modification of the unitary view" of man.³⁶ In two places

²⁸ See the excellent discussion in W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, pp. 141ff.

²⁹ E. Schweizer, *TDNT* VI, 435.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 436. The German uses the word "organ," which Bromiley translates "vehicle."

³¹ W. G. Kümmel, *Man in the NT* (1963), p. 44.

³² W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, p. 135.

³³ C. K. Barrett, *Romans* (1957), p. 17, translates it "the Spirit (of God) is life-giving." See also F. F. Bruce, *Romans* (1963), p. 164.

³⁴ See commentaries by W. Sanday and J. Denney *in loc*. See also R. P. Martin in *The New Bible Commentary* (1970), p. 1031.

³⁵ W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, p. 126.

³⁶ D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul* (1964), p. 38. See also S. Laeuchli, "Monism and Dualism in the Pauline Anthropology," *Biblical Research*, 3 (1958), 15-27.

Paul refers to survival after death. To be away from the body is to be at home with the Lord (II Cor. 5:8). To be sure, Paul shrinks from the idea of being "naked," i.e., of being a disembodied spirit,³⁷ for full existence must always be bodily existence; and what Paul longs for is the resurrection body. However, he comforts himself with the thought that he will be with the Lord. The same thought is expressed in Philipians 1:23-24: "my desire is to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better." We may not attribute this modification of the monistic view of man to outside Hellenistic dualism, but to Paul's own conviction that even death cannot separate the believer from the love of Christ (Rom. 8:38).

SŌMA. As obvious and simple a subject as "body" (*sōma*) ought not to involve difficulties of interpretation; but problems have been raised that make this a most complex problem. As indicated above, Bultmann has vigorously defended the position that the Pauline concept of man does not conceive of him as a person of two constituent parts, an inner spiritual life and the outer material body. Bultmann insists that man cannot be partitioned but is viewed as an indivisible entity; and that *sōma*, *pneuma*, and *psychē* constitute merely different ways of looking upon man in his entirety. Pursuing this interpretation, Bultmann insists that *sōma* is not something that outwardly clings to man's real self (to his soul, for instance), but belongs to its very essence so that we can say, "Man does not have a *sōma*; he is *sōma*."³⁸ Bultmann admits that there are sayings where there appear to be reflections of the naive, popular usage in which *sōma* is contrasted with the soul or spirit; but such passages do not reflect the essential Pauline thought. Man, his person as a whole, can be denoted by *sōma*. If I give my body to be burned (I Cor. 13:3) I deliver *myself* to death. When Paul says that he pummels his body and subdues it (I Cor. 9:27), he means that he is bringing *himself* under control. That a woman is not to rule over her own body (I Cor. 7:4) means that she is not to have control of herself, but rather to submit to her husband. The offering of the body as a living sacrifice (Rom. 12:2) means the surrender of one's self to God. The magnification of Christ in my body (Phil. 1:20) means the honoring of Christ in my person, in myself. Taking his point of departure from such references, Bultmann interprets the body to mean "man in respect to his being able to make himself the object of his own action, or to experience himself as the subject to whom something happens."³⁹ As *sōma*, man can be the object of his own control.

There is a truth here that merits emphasis. Clearly, *sōma* is an essential element in man, and from this point of view *sōma* can stand as an equivalent for "I." I have no experience with myself except in a bodily form of existence. "I," "self" must always be expressed in bodily terms, and therefore the control of my body is the control of myself. The important truth

³⁷ See below, pp. 552f.

³⁸ *Theology*, I, 194.

³⁹ *Theology*, I, 195.

that emerges is this: somatic existence is conceived as being the normal and proper mode of existence. *Sōma* is an *essential*, not an unimportant element in human existence. The life of the soul or spirit is not contrasted with bodily life in terms of true and essential life over and against that which is extraneous or incidental or as though the body of itself were an obstacle standing in the way of the realization of man's true life. We shall see that the body can *become* an obstacle, but it is not a hindrance of itself. There is no depreciation of the body per se.

The import of this may be seen from the fact that redeemed, glorified existence will be somatic existence, not a "spiritual," i.e., nonmaterial mode of being. Glorification will include the redemption of the body (Rom. 8:23). The coming of Christ will mean the transformation of our lowly bodies into the likeness of his glorious body (Phil. 4:3-21). The basic argument of I Corinthians 15 is directed against a Greek view of the survival of personality apart from any form of bodily existence. Paul's argument rests upon the necessity of a body for full, rich life. The resurrection will involve somatic existence, although not *fleshly* existence. "Flesh and blood," that is, our present fleshly bodies, cannot inherit the Kingdom of God (I Cor. 15:50). This impossibility does not inhere in the intrinsic evil of the body as such but in the mortal character of the fleshly body. There are, however, different kinds of bodies; resurrection life will be bodily life and Paul describes it as a "spiritual body" (I Cor. 15:44). The one point to be emphasized here is that this involves a real body, however different it may be from our mortal physical bodies.⁴⁰ The work of redemption does not mean merely the salvation of the soul or spirit; it includes the redemption of the body. The ultimate and perfect mode of life designed by God that his people may enjoy the fullness of the divine blessings will be a somatic existence. The survival of personality that is often presented as the essence of the Christian hope is a Greek teaching and is not the equivalent of the biblical hope of a fulfilled redemption.

We now turn to a brief statement of Paul's positive teaching about the Christian's attitude toward his body. First, although the body is an integral part of man's being, the body of flesh is corruptible and mortal (Rom. 6:12; 8:11; II Cor. 4:11) and therefore is not the realm in which one now finds his true life. It is in fact a "body of death" (Rom. 7:24). Second, the body is not only weak and mortal but also an instrument of the flesh. Sin and death do not, however, reside in corporeality itself or in the natural body but in the flesh.⁴¹ Since sin can reign in the mortal body (Rom. 6:12), the body viewed as the instrumentality of sin can be called a sinful body (Rom. 6:6); and therefore the man indwelt by the Spirit must put to death the deeds of the body (Rom. 8:13). This, however, is not mortification of the body itself, but of its sinful acts.

⁴⁰ For a further discussion of the resurrection body, see Ch. 38.

⁴¹ As indicated below, "flesh" is to be understood ethically and not physically. In such contexts it refers to fallen human nature and not the material constituting the body.

Third, the body must be kept in subjection. Although it is an integral part of human existence, since the body is mortal and capable of sin it must be disciplined and prevented from gaining domination over a man's spiritual life. This life is found in the inner man, in the realm of the spirit when it is quickened and energized by the Spirit of God. The outward man, the body, slowly wastes away and it succumbs to death (II Cor. 4:16). The highest object of one's existence is to be found in the spiritual realm, and the body, therefore, must become the servant of the spirit, the true self. The body cannot become master, for of itself it is not one's true life. Paul sets forth this truth very clearly in I Corinthians 9. In the first part of the chapter he contrasts the spiritual and physical realms. Because he is a minister in spiritual things, Paul insists that he has a right to physical rewards and enjoyments. Nevertheless he refuses to exercise his liberty lest the material realm become his master. The "perishable wreath," that is, bodily, material satisfactions, is not his goal. Therefore he exercises rigorous self-control, like an athlete in training, holding his body in check that it may not gain the upper hand over his spiritual life. The material realm must be made subservient to the spiritual lest Paul be disqualified and lose the crown. There is no hint here that physical satisfactions in themselves involve any evil or degrading influence; on the contrary, it is implied that they are perfectly natural and good. The danger is that they become the end of one's life and thus defeat the higher spiritual goals. It is when the body would frustrate spiritual ends that it must be disciplined.

Fourth, self-control over the body is attained by its consecration to God. The body is to be presented to God as a living sacrifice (Rom. 12:1). This is not achieved by asceticism and mortification of the body itself. On the contrary, the Christian is to recognize that his body is indwelt by the Spirit of God (I Cor. 6:19) and is a member of Christ (I Cor. 6:15). The body is to be an instrument in the service of Christ. Since the body shares in sanctification even while it is mortal, it follows that the Christian must exercise a cultivation and care for the body and use it as a means of the fullest realization of his spiritual life. So intimate is the relationship between the body and the spirit that sins of the body touch the very springs of personality. Therefore bodily enjoyments are not an end in themselves but are to be made subservient to spiritual ends.

Fifth, as we have already pointed out, the bodies of believers are themselves to be redeemed in the day of consummated salvation (Rom. 8:23; Phil. 3:21).

SARX. The most difficult and complicated aspect of the Pauline psychology is his doctrine of *sarx*. The difficulty arises both because of the complexity of Paul's use of the word, and because of one usage that is characteristic of Paul but which is rarely found elsewhere; and this peculiarly Pauline doctrine of flesh has been subject to diverse interpretations. We may first trace briefly the various meanings that are given to the word in the Pauline terminology.

SARX IS THE BODILY TISSUES. *Sarx* is frequently used to describe the tissues that constitute the body and is thus contrasted with bones and blood. There are different kinds of flesh, of men, of animals, of birds, of fish (I Cor. 15:39). Pain and suffering may be experienced in the flesh (II Cor. 12:7); circumcision was wrought in the flesh (Rom. 2:28). Jesus' body was a body of flesh (Col. 1:22). Flesh, however, is corruptible and cannot inherit the Kingdom of God (I Cor. 15:50).

SARX IS THE BODY ITSELF. By a natural transition, the part is used for the whole, and in many places *sarx* is synonymous with the body as a whole rather than designating the fleshly part of the body. Paul may thus speak either of being absent in the body (I Cor. 5:3) or in the flesh (Col. 2:5). "The one who joins himself to a harlot is one body (with her), for it says, the two shall be one flesh" (I Cor. 6:16, 17). Paul can say that "the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies" or "in our mortal flesh" (II Cor. 4:10, 11).⁴²

SARX IS MAN WITH REFERENCE TO HIS ORIGIN. Following the Old Testament usage, *sarx* is used to refer not merely to the material of the body or to the body itself, but concretely to man who is constituted of flesh. In this usage the word may refer particularly to man's human relationships, his physical origin and the natural ties that bind him to other men. Paul speaks of his kinsmen "according to the flesh," his fellow-Jews (Rom. 9:3). The "children of the flesh" (Rom. 9:8) are those born by natural generation in contrast with those born as a result of divine intervention. Israel "after the flesh" (I Cor. 10:18) is natural Israel, those who are physically Jews. Paul can even use "my flesh" (Rom. 11:14) as a synonym for his kinsmen, fellow-Jews. Christ was descended from David according to the flesh (Rom. 1:3). The phrase does not designate merely the source of his *bodily* life but of his entire human existence including both his body and human spirit.

SARX IS MAN IN TERMS OF HIS OUTWARD APPEARANCE AND CONDITIONS.⁴³ A further extension of *sarx* reaches beyond man in his bodily life to include other factors that are inseparable elements to human existence. "Confidence in the flesh" (Phil. 3:3ff.) does not mean confidence in the body, but confidence in the whole complex of the outward realm of human existence. It includes Paul's Jewish ancestry, his strict religious training, his zeal and his prominence in Jewish religious circles. The phrase "boasting according to the flesh" is rendered "boasting of worldly things" in II Corinthians 11:18 (RSV). A good showing "in the flesh" is practically synonymous with worldly prominence (Gal. 6:12-14).

⁴² For other illustrations see Eph. 5:28-31; II Cor. 7:1; Col. 2:1; Gal. 4:13; Eph. 2:15.

⁴³ See E. Schweizer, *TDNT* VII, 126ff.

The Judaizers insisted upon circumcision to promote a sense of prideful attainment in the religious life that they might have a ground of glorying. But these external distinctions and grounds of glorying no longer appealed to Paul because the world had been crucified to him and he to the world.

In the three references cited above, "the flesh" refers to the sphere of societal relationships in which a man is compared with his fellow men, and the emphasis rests particularly upon religious attainments and their appeal to human pride. The word is also used of outward relationships in describing the social ties existing between slave and master (Phlm. 16; Col. 3:22; Eph. 6:5). *En sarki* describes also the realm of marital relationships, which entails certain troublesome problems (I Cor. 7:28).

This usage illuminates an otherwise difficult passage: "from now on, we regard no one according to the flesh; even though we once regarded Christ according to the flesh, we regard him thus no longer" (II Cor. 5:16). The RSV correctly renders the phrase, "from a human point of view." This verse cannot be used to support the view that Paul has no interest in the historical Jesus; and it provides no evidence to answer the question as to whether Paul had ever personally known the historical Jesus. Paul is referring to a transformation in his own outlook on all the relationships of life. At one time the "human viewpoint" predominated Paul's outlook and it was then of the greatest importance whether a man practiced a legal righteousness and devoted himself to a perfect obedience to the Jewish torah. From this point of view, Jesus who had sought out publicans and sinners and who had been crucified as a common criminal could not possibly be the Messiah but must be an impostor. However, now Paul's viewpoint is completely transformed and these matters of human relationships and religious pride are quite irrelevant. To be in Christ is to be a new creation by virtue of which an entirely different interpretation is given to life and its relationships (v. 17).

This usage in a few passages is extended to describe the whole state or sphere in which men naturally live, the way of life that characterizes ordinary human existence. Paul had been accused in Corinth of seeking his own selfish ends and of conducting himself for his own self-advantage. Such people accused him of acting "according to the flesh"; but Paul replies that though he lives "in the flesh," he is not carrying on a warfare "according to the flesh," for his weapons are not fleshly but divine (II Cor. 10:1-3). Here the expression "to live in the flesh" cannot refer to bodily existence per se; that is too obvious to be mentioned. Paul admits that he lives in the midst of a *world system*, but insists that his ministry is not performed by resources that are derived from this worldly system or are in accordance with worldly principles. The emphasis is not upon the *sinfulness* of the worldly order; in fact, a Christian must of necessity live in its midst. Such a system is, however, impotent to provide the resources to reach a divine goal. The same use appears where Paul says that "not many wise according to the flesh, not many powerful, not many of

noble birth were called" (I Cor. 1:26). The realm "according to the flesh" is the sphere of life that characterizes human existence; it has its wisdom, its nobility, and its power. It is not sinful intrinsically, but it is impotent to attain to the wisdom and the knowledge of God. A new and higher level of existence is necessary to enter into the world of divine realities.

THE ETHICAL USE OF SARX. There remains a group of references that are distinctly Pauline, which are usually called the "ethical" use of the term.⁴⁴ The most important feature about this usage is that man as flesh is contrasted with Spirit, is sinful, and without the aid of the Spirit cannot please God. The most vivid passage is the first part of Romans 8. Paul sharply contrasts those who are "in the flesh" and "in the Spirit." Those who are in the flesh cannot please God. "But you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if the Spirit of God really dwells in you" (Rom. 8:8, 9). Formally, the statement "Those who are in the flesh cannot please God" is contradicted by Galatians 2:20: "The life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God." Obviously, Paul is using the same phrase to designate two very different things. To be "in the flesh" (Gal. 2:20) is to be in the physical body, which can be existence in faith. "In the flesh" in Romans 8:8 means, according to verse 9, not to be indwelt by the Spirit, i.e., to be an unregenerate man. Those who are unregenerate, not indwelt by the Spirit, cannot fulfill the Law of God and thereby please him. This statement surely does not mean that they can do no deed that pleases God. Romans 2:15 affirms that even Gentiles have the Law of God in some way written in their hearts; and so far as they obey the inner Law, they must be pleasing to God. Romans 8:8 means that unregenerate man cannot please God by loving him and serving him as God desires. Thus the Law was unable to make men please God because the flesh is weak (Rom. 8:2). To live after the flesh is death; to live after the Spirit is life (Rom. 8:6). Elsewhere Paul says, "I know that nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh" (Rom. 7:18). Flesh here cannot be the physical flesh, for the body of flesh is the temple of the Spirit (I Cor. 6:19) and a member of Christ (I Cor. 6:15), and is to be the means of glorifying God (I Cor. 6:20). Paul means that in his unregenerate nature there dwells none of the goodness that God demands.

The flesh is something that stays with the believer even after he has received the Spirit. Writing to Christians, Paul says that the flesh and the Spirit are opposed to each other "to prevent you from doing what you would" (Gal. 5:17). There is a conflict that rages in the Christian's breast. Reception of the Spirit does not mean that the problem of the flesh is dis-

⁴⁴ See H. W. Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man* (1926), p. 114; W. D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* (1926), p. 153. The following list, which is close to that of Davies, represents this usage: Rom. 6:19; 7:5, 18, 25; 8:3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13; I Cor. 5:5; II Cor. 1:17; 11:18; Gal. 3:3; 5:13, 16, 17, 19, 24; 6:8; Eph. 2:3; Col. 2:11, 13, 18, 23.

posed of. There is a conflict between the flesh and the Spirit in which the believer must learn how to let the Spirit have dominance.

DIFFERENT VIEWPOINTS. We have followed the RSV in capitalizing Spirit, believing that it refers to the divine Spirit that is given and not intrinsic to man. However, many scholars have interpreted Paul's doctrine of the flesh in terms of Hellenistic dualism in which the flesh is the actual body, which is viewed as essentially sinful.⁴⁵ The source of evil is materiality itself. This dualistic interpretation has been given a classical statement in Pfleiderer, who understands Paul's concept of sin to be that a demonic spiritual being finds its residence in the physical flesh; and while therefore the flesh itself is not identical with sin, it is nevertheless the seat and organ of the demonic sinful principle. Because man physically consists of flesh, he has become enslaved to the sinful power that dwells in his material substance.⁴⁶

Against this dualistic interpretation, there stands the incontrovertible fact that Paul did not view the body as sinful per se; and therefore when *sarx* is viewed as sinful, it must refer to something other than the physical material that constitutes my body. The body is made for the Lord (I Cor. 6:13) and is to be joined with Christ (v. 15). The body is indwelt by the Spirit of God (I Cor. 6:19) and is to be the means by which God is glorified (v. 20). The body shares the experience of sanctification (I Cor. 7:34) and is to be presented to God as a living sacrifice that is holy and well-pleasing to God (Rom. 12:1).⁴⁷

A second view interprets *sarx* in the light of an alleged ethical dualism innate in man's nature. Within man there are two principles: the higher and the lower, *pneuma* and *sarx*, and between these two an incessant conflict is waged. The Christian is the man who by divine help has found victory for the higher spiritual principle. The spirit of man is the true ego, the better self, the spiritual nature in which he is most kindred to God, that imperishable part which relates him to the eternal and imperishable world. In Christians this higher life has become the predominant element, and in them the human spirit is developed and assumes dominance in the conduct of life.⁴⁸ This innate ethical dualism is vividly depicted in the words of Beyschlag, "But none of the apostles has described, like Paul, the overpowering strength of the flesh, the sensuous, selfish nature, or has emphasized the feebleness of the divine in man, which is like a smoking flax or a latent germ; and no one, like him, has made the whole work of salvation bear upon this evil element in man and nature; for salvation, founded by Christ as the ideal spiritual man, consists in breaking the power of the

⁴⁵ See W. Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul* (1917), pp. 17ff.

⁴⁶ See O. Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity* (1906), I, 280; see also Pfleiderer's *Paulinism* (1891), I, 47-67.

⁴⁷ J. A. T. Robinson goes so far as to say that *sōma* stands for man as made for God (*The Body* [1952], p. 31). This seems to go too far; *pneuma* is man in his relationship to God.

⁴⁸ See G. B. Stevens, *The Theology of the NT* (1899), pp. 343f.

flesh and kindling the smoking flax of the spirit into a clear, holy flame through supplies from above; and that flame first of all transfigures the heart and the conduct, and, finally, it changes the mortal body also into the image of the perfected Christ."⁴⁹

The objection to this interpretation rests in the fact that the conflict Paul finds between the flesh and the spirit is not between the flesh and the human spirit, but between human flesh and the Spirit of God. That the higher side of the conflict in Romans 8:4-8 is the Holy Spirit and not man's spirit is indubitably clear from verse 9, "But you are not in the flesh, you are in the Spirit, if the Spirit of God really dwells in you" (Rom. 8:9). In this state the human spirit is indeed alive, but it is due to the fact that the Spirit of God who raised Jesus from the dead dwells within man (Rom. 8:10, 11). Paul does frequently speak of the human spirit, as we have already seen, but he does not contrast it with *sarx*. The conflict that is depicted in Galatians 5:16-26 is not found in the unregenerate man but only in the man in whom the Spirit of God has come to dwell. Within such a man, there arises a conflict between the Spirit and *sarx* that is resolved only when the "flesh is crucified" and the Spirit obtains complete mastery of his life.

A third interpretation is that of Rudolf Bultmann, who insists that Paul's concept of the flesh does not extend beyond that of the preceding discussion in which flesh is viewed as the realm of man's earthly-natural existence, which, in contrast to God, is weak and transitory. When this realm of the external and the natural becomes the objective of man's pursuit, it becomes not merely the earthly-transitory in contrast with the transcendent-eternal, but is viewed as being positively sinful and opposed to God. That conduct or attitude which directs itself toward the flesh, taking flesh for its norm, is sinful. The pursuit of the merely human, the earthly-transitory, is sinful, because man should find his true life in God.⁵⁰

This interpretation is far more attractive and consonant with the exegetical data than either of the two already discussed. But these data require a position that goes further than Bultmann. Bultmann is himself compelled to recognize that sometimes *sarx* is personified and becomes practically equivalent to "I."⁵¹ Furthermore, the "works of the flesh" are not primarily directed to the world of externality and the outward realm of the earthly-natural; such sins as enmity, jealousy, selfishness, and envy are "sins of the spirit," which may or may not have their manifestation in the realm of external relationships (Gal. 5:19-21). They are self-centered rather than God-centered, and the flesh is myself seeking its own ends in opposition to the Spirit of God. Bultmann's interpretation requires him to exegete the phrases "when we were in the flesh" (Rom. 7:5) and "you are not in the flesh, you are in the Spirit" (Rom. 8:9) proleptically to refer in a promis-

⁴⁹ W. Beyschlag, *NT Theology* (1895), II, 46f.

⁵⁰ R. Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 233-38. See also H. Conzelmann, *Theology of the NT* (1969), p. 179; J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body*, p. 25.

⁵¹ R. Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 245.

sory manner to the glorified state.⁵² This, however, does not appear to be Paul's meaning. He is not looking forward to future deliverance from the flesh but affirms a present state of existence that is in the Spirit and not in the flesh. The man who is "in the Spirit" in fact continues to live "in the flesh" (Gal. 2:20); but while he continues to live in the body and in the natural world, he is no longer "in the flesh" but "in the Spirit" because the Spirit of God really dwells within him. We can only conclude that the expression, to be "in the flesh," means to live as an unregenerate man, to be a man who is not indwelt by the Spirit of God. *Sarx* ethically conceived is human nature, man viewed in his entirety apart from and in contrast with the righteousness and holiness of God. As such, man is not only weak and impotent, he is also sinful and rebellious against God. Paul differentiates absolutely between the realms "in the Spirit" and "in the flesh" in Romans 8:4-11. A man belongs either to one realm or to the other; and a man's status is determined by whether or not he is indwelt by the Spirit of God. Those who are indwelt by the Spirit are "in the Spirit"; the natural man is "in the flesh." The latter lives out his entire life in the humanness that will issue in death. Man is able to serve God only when God's Spirit has indwelt and quickened him in the realm of the spirit (v. 10).

A fourth view is that of W. D. Davies, who sees the background for the conflict between flesh and spirit in the rabbinic doctrine of two inclinations, the good inclination (*yetzer hatob*) and the evil inclination (*yetzer hara*), which indwell all men and struggle for supremacy.⁵³ However, there is one distinct difference between Paul and the rabbis: for them the good inclination was an innate possession of all men, while the Spirit that opposes the flesh in Paul is not the human spirit but the divine Spirit, possessed only by believers.⁵⁴

SARX IS UNREGENERATE HUMAN NATURE. We follow those scholars who understand this "ethical" use of *sarx* to refer neither to man's physical materiality nor to a lower element in man, but to man as a whole, seen in his fallenness, opposed to God. This usage is a natural development of the Old Testament use of *basar*, which is man viewed in his frailty and weakness before God. When this is applied to the ethical realm, it becomes man in his ethical weakness, i.e., sinfulness before God. *Sarx* represents not a part of man but man as a whole—unregenerate, fallen, sinful man. "In the case of *sarx* the predominant thought [is] of man standing by himself over against God—in other words, the natural man conceived as not

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 236.

⁵³ W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (1955), pp. 17-35.

⁵⁴ Certain parallels exist between Paul and the Qumran community (K. G. Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the NT" in *The Scrolls and the NT*, ed. by Krister Stendahl [1958], pp. 94-113). However, Davies has pointed out that the similarities are largely those of language and not of substance or theology. See W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls; Flesh and Spirit," *Christian Origins and Judaism* (1962), pp. 145-78. For other views see W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, pp. 41-55, 163-73.

having yet received grace, or as yet not wholly under its influence.”⁵⁵ “The Apostle does not identify *sarx* with the material body or outward bodily substance of man.”⁵⁶ “Gal. 5:19f. makes it clear that when ‘flesh’ is used in a moral sense it does not necessarily have any physical meaning, since most of the sins ascribed to the lower nature (*sarx*) could well be practiced by a disembodied spirit.”⁵⁷ “It was not only in the physical desires, but in every department of the life, that sin was manifested. . . . The persistence of sinful acts suggests a principle of sin in each man, a lower sinful nature; it was identified with the flesh. The flesh became a synonym for the lower nature in general in contrast to the higher self. . . . The lower nature was so much an entity that it had a mind (Col. 2:18, Rom. 8:6) of its own.”⁵⁸ We cannot follow Stacey if he means that the “lower nature” is identified with the physical flesh. As indicated above, many of the “ethical” references have no physical connotations. “The evidence is against the view that Paul found in the flesh as a physical thing a compelling force for evil. The flesh that makes for evil is not the body or matter as such, but an inherited impulse to evil.”⁵⁹

While Paul makes a sharp and absolute contrast between being “in the flesh” (unregenerate) and being “in the spirit” (regenerate), there remains in the believer a struggle between the flesh and spirit. If “flesh” means unregenerate human nature, the believer still possesses this nature even though he has received the Spirit. Even in the Christian the flesh struggles against the Spirit so that he cannot be the (perfect) man that he would wish to be (Gal. 5:17).⁶⁰

This same situation is reflected in I Corinthians 2:14-3:3, where Paul describes three classes of people: *psychikos*, the natural man (2:14); *sar-kikos*, the fleshly man (3:3); and *pneumatikos*, the spiritual man (3:1). In this passage the “natural man” is the unregenerate man, the man who is “in the flesh” (Rom. 8:9), that is, the whole realm of his life is devoted to the human level and as such he is unable to know the things of God. The “spiritual man” is the man whose life is ruled by the Holy Spirit. Between these two is a third class of those who are “fleshly” yet who are babes *in Christ*. They must therefore be “in the Spirit,” yet they do not walk “according to the Spirit.” Because they are babes in Christ, we must conclude that the Spirit of God dwells in them; yet the Holy Spirit does not exercise full control over their lives, and they are still walking “like men” (v. 3), manifesting the works of the flesh in jealousy and strife. The man who is “in the Spirit” and no longer “in the flesh,” that is, a regenerate

⁵⁵ W. P. Dickson, *St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit* (1883), p. 271. This old book remains a classic study of this theme.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 310.

⁵⁷ D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul*, p. 39.

⁵⁸ W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, p. 163.

⁵⁹ E. D. Burton, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh* (1918), p. 197.

⁶⁰ For the interpretation of the conflict in Rom. 7, see the chapter on the Law. In this chapter Paul does not speak of a conflict between the flesh and the Spirit, but between the flesh and the Law.

man indwelt by the Spirit of God, has yet to learn the lesson of walking by the Spirit and not by the flesh.

VICTORY OVER THE FLESH. While a struggle remains in the Christian between the Spirit and the flesh, Paul knows the way of victory for the Spirit. The flesh of the body comes within the orb of sanctification (I Thess. 5:23). But the flesh as unregenerate human nature can only be put to death.

Here we meet the familiar Pauline tension between the indicative and the imperative.⁶¹ Paul views the death of the flesh as something that has already happened in the death of Christ. Those who belong to Christ have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires (Gal. 5:24). They have put off the body of flesh⁶² in the circumcision of Christ, that is, in the circumcision of the heart, which is accomplished by Christ (Col. 2:11). Paul says, "I have been crucified with Christ" (Gal. 2:20), and "our old self was crucified with him" (Rom. 6:6). The identity of the flesh and the self is further supported in this teaching of crucifixion, for Paul means the same thing by the crucifixion of the flesh as he means when he says, "How can we who died to sin still live in it?" "We have been united with him in death." "We are buried with him by baptism into death" (Rom. 6:2-4). It is I, myself, who have died with Christ.

The same idea is expressed in a different idiom in Colossians 3:9: "Do not lie to one another, seeing that you have put off the old nature (*anthrōpon*) with its practices and have put on the new nature (*anthrōpon*)." This views a change as already having taken place. The "old man" "denotes the sinful being of the unconverted man."⁶³ This is another way of saying that the old self (*anthrōpon*) has been crucified with Christ (Rom. 6:6).

This death of the flesh is not, however, something that works automatically. It is an event that must be appropriated by faith. This involves two aspects. Believers are to recognize that the flesh has been crucified with Christ, and therefore "consider *yourselves* dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 6:11). One cannot consider himself dead with Christ unless he has actually died and been crucified with Christ; but because this has happened, it can be put into practice in daily experience. Because I have died with Christ, I am to "put to death the deeds of the body" (Rom. 8:13). "Body" is here used as a vehicle for the works of the "flesh"—the sensual life of the unregenerate nature. Because I have been brought from death into life, I am to "yield my members to God as instruments of righteousness" (Rom. 6:13). Because I have died with Christ, I am to "put to death what is earthly . . . : immorality, impurity, . . ." (Col. 3:5). Because I have already put off the old nature and put on the new nature, I am to put on compassion, kindness, lowliness, and the like (Col. 3:12).

⁶¹ See below, pp. 524ff.

⁶² The phrase, "the body of flesh," cannot here refer to the fleshy body, but to "the personality as dominated by sensuality," a self-centered, sensual self. C. F. D. Moule, *Colossians* (1957), p. 95.

⁶³ J. Jeremias, *TDNT* I, 365.

Another way of describing victory over the flesh is "to walk in the Spirit." "Walk in the Spirit, and do not gratify the desires of the flesh" (Gal. 5:16; cf. Rom. 8:4). Walking in the Spirit means to live each moment under the control of the Holy Spirit. Walking involves living a step at a time, moment by moment; and to walk in the Spirit means to take each step of my earthly walk under the direction and control and leadership of the Holy Spirit.

HEART.⁶⁴ There are several other words used by Paul to characterize man, the most important of which is the heart (*kardia*). The Pauline usage is essentially the same as the Hebrew word *lēb*⁶⁵ and designates the inner life of man from various points of view. The heart or inner aspect of man is contrasted to the outward and visible. True circumcision is a matter of the heart (Rom. 2:29), not of the flesh. Physical absence can mean presence in heart (I Thess. 2:17). Outward glory is vanity compared to that of the heart (II Cor. 5:12). The heart holds secrets that only the Holy Spirit can reveal (I Cor. 4:5; 14:25). True knowledge of man can be found only by searching the heart (Rom. 8:27).

The heart is the seat of the emotions, both good and bad. The heart can lust for evil things (Rom. 1:24); but Paul can say that his heart's desire is for the conversion of his fellow-Jews (Rom. 10:1). Paul wrote to the Corinthians in "anguish of heart" (II Cor. 2:4); he was pained in his heart because the Jews had rejected Christ (Rom. 9:2). His plea to the Corinthians to "open your hearts to us" (II Cor. 7:3) means to receive them in love.

A word bearing a similar meaning is *splangchna*, wrongly translated "bowels" in the KJV. The *splangchna* were the nobler organs—the heart, liver, and lungs—⁶⁶ and in Paul the word is used of Christian affection (II Cor. 6:12; 7:15; Col. 3:12; Phlm. 7, 12, 20). In Philipians 1:8 and 2:1 it means love.

Kardia can also be used for man's intellectual activity. In Romans 1:21, the heart of ungodly men is without understanding.⁶⁷ In II Corinthians 9:7 Paul exhorts his reader to give liberally "as he has made up his mind" (RSV). The "eyes of the heart" must be enlightened (Eph. 1:18) to understand the Christians' hope.

Kardia can be used of the seat of the will. The heart has purposes or intentions that only God knows (I Cor. 4:5). The heart can be impenitent because it is willful in wrongdoing (Rom. 2:5). The heart can be obedient (Rom. 6:17), i.e., supported by the will.

The *kardia* is the organ of ethical judgment. The "senseless hearts" of ungodly men are those whose sin has made them incapable of sound judg-

⁶⁴ R. Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 220-26; W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, pp. 194-97.

⁶⁵ H. W. Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, p. 106.

⁶⁶ H. Köster, *TDNT* VII, 548.

⁶⁷ The RSV translates *kardia* by "minds."

ment (Rom. 1:21). The Gentiles possess a law, written in their hearts, that enables them to distinguish between good and evil (Rom. 2:14). The heart can be corrupt (Rom. 2:5) or enlightened (II Cor. 4:6).

The *kardia* is the seat of religious experience. God can shine in the heart (II Cor. 4:6); the heart receives the down payment of the Spirit (II Cor. 1:22); the heart experiences the outpouring of God's love (Rom. 5:5); Christ can dwell in the heart (Eph. 3:17); the peace of Christ can reign in the heart (Col. 3:15).

MIND. Paul often speaks of the mind (*nous*),⁶⁸ by which he designates man as a knowing, thinking, judging creature. *Nous* is not used of man engaged in speculative, reflective reason; the word can be used of practical judgment.

That *nous* is the organ of understanding is obvious in Paul's discussion of tongues. When one prays in a tongue, his spirit prays but his mind is unfruitful (I Cor. 14:14), i.e., he does not understand his own words. The peace of God surpasses all thought (Phil. 4:7). Paul exhorts the Thessalonians not to be shaken in their minds (II Thess. 2:2), i.e., confused in thought.

That *nous* is not speculative reason but moral judgment is clear from the fact that godless men have a "base mind" (Rom. 1:28). They live in "the futility of their minds" (Eph. 4:17). Even the flesh can be said to have its mind (Col. 2:18), which leads to vain pride. In believers the mind must be constantly renewed (Rom. 12:2; Eph. 4:23). Clearly, the *nous* is a human faculty that can be dominated either by evil or by God.

The religious aspect of the word is seen in that Paul can speak of the mind of God (Rom. 11:34), and of the mind of Christ (I Cor. 2:16), which means insight into the very mind of God himself. The "mind of the Lord" is undoubtedly his hidden plan of salvation, now revealed.⁶⁹

Nous can also designate "the moral consciousness as it concretely determines will and action."⁷⁰ In Romans 7, the *nous* approves of the Law of God, recognizes its spiritual character, and desires to obey it (Rom. 7:23). But the flesh dominates the mind in the unregenerate man, so that although he serves the Law of God with his mind, with the flesh he serves the law of sin (Rom. 7:25).

*THE INNER MAN.*⁷¹ Paul uses the phrase *ho esō anthrōpos* in two different ways: of the unregenerate man and of the regenerate man. In Romans 7:22, the "inmost self" is used synonymously with the "mind," which can approve of the Law of God and will to obey it, but finds itself impotent. Behm describes this as "the spiritual side of man, or man him-

⁶⁸ See R. Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 211-16; E. Würthwein, *TDNT* IV, 958-59; W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, pp. 198-205.

⁶⁹ E. Würthwein, *TDNT* IV, 959.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 958.

⁷¹ See J. Behm, *TDNT* II, 698-99; W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, pp. 211-14.

self in so far as he enjoys self-awareness, as he thinks and wills and feels."⁷² In II Corinthians 4:16, the inner man is contrasted with the "outer man"—man as a corruptible earthly being. While the outer man is wasting away, the inner man is being renewed every day. "The inward man is the real self that passes from the body of flesh to the body of resurrection."⁷³ In both instances, "the inner man" is the higher, essential self, either redeemed or redeemable, made for God and opposed to sin.⁷⁴

*CONSCIENCE.*⁷⁵ Paul uses another word that has no Hebrew equivalent: *syneidēsis*. However, while the term was widely used by Greek philosophers, especially the Stoics, the idea is included in the Hebrew word for heart, *lēb*.⁷⁶ Conscience is a universal faculty. Paul speaks of his own conscience (Rom. 9:1), the conscience of Christians (I Cor. 8:1-13; 10:23-11:1), and the conscience of Gentiles (Rom. 2:15). The conscience is the faculty of moral judgment. The word *syneidēsis* means knowledge shared with one's self. It is man's consciousness of his conduct as his own,⁷⁷ and his judgment as to whether it is right or wrong. When Paul says, "I am not aware of anything against myself" (I Cor. 4:4),⁷⁸ he means that his conscience is clear; it does not condemn him of having done anything wrong. However, conscience is not the court of last appeal. It is not an autonomous, self-sufficient guide. He goes on to say, "but I am not thereby acquitted. It is the Lord who judges me." Conscience at best is, therefore, a guide of relative value. One could have a clear conscience, and yet be guilty of wrong in the sight of God. In Romans 9:1, he links the verdict of conscience with the Holy Spirit; but he nowhere develops the relation between these two guides.

He challenges the Corinthians to judge his conduct in the light of their conscience. He commends himself to every man's conscience "in the sight of God" (II Cor. 4:2). This means that conscience is to judge Paul's conduct in the light of the revelation that God has given. He again asserts that God knows the motivations for his conduct, and he hopes the consciences of the Corinthians will agree (II Cor. 5:11). In I Timothy 1:5 and 19, he links a good conscience with sincere faith. However, conscience is not an absolute guide. When men depart from the faith, their conscience can become seared (I Tim. 4:2), i.e., hardened so that it is not a safe guide. All this suggests that the conscience of the Christian must always be exercised in the light of the divine revelation in Jesus Christ.

In the question of eating meats offered to idols he speaks of those who

⁷² J. Behm, *TDNT* II, 699.

⁷³ W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, p. 211.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

⁷⁵ C. Maurer, *TDNT* VII, 914-17; C. A. Pierce, *Conscience in the NT* (1955); W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, pp. 206-10; W. D. Davies, *IDB* A-D, pp. 674-75; R. Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 216-20.

⁷⁶ W. D. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, p. 206.

⁷⁷ R. Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 217.

⁷⁸ Here he uses the verb *sunoida*. See also II Cor. 1:12.

have a “weak conscience” because they do not all possess correct knowledge (I Cor. 8:7). They do not understand that “everything is indeed clean” (Rom. 14:20). However, even for such, the conscience is a guide that must not be violated; and Paul exhorts those who have a strong conscience, i.e., who understand that “the earth is the Lord’s and everything in it” (I Cor. 10:26), so to conduct themselves that they do not by example encourage the weak to defile their conscience (I Cor. 8:9-13).

Unbelievers, as well as Christians, have a conscience. When the Gentiles who do not have the Old Testament Law to guide them do the right, “they show that what the law requires is written on their hearts, while their conscience also bears witness and their conflicting thoughts accuse or perhaps excuse them” (Rom. 2:15). Paul does not intimate that conscience is a guide that can lead to salvation; he only says that because they have conscience, they know the difference between right and wrong.